APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,977	03/05/2002	David D. Rowley	23415-014	9574

29315   7590   08/25/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
ROVNAK, JOHN EDMUND

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/087,977	ROWLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John E. Rovnak	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 August 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

In view of the papers filed 07/07/2004, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by adding Sean D. Gale as an inventor.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of Office records to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

The finality of the last office action is withdrawn. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harned et al (6594466).

Harned et al discloses a computer implemented method comprising presenting an examination items to a user comprising a practical exercise and questions,

associating a virtual machine with the exercise, displaying information that is associated

with the practical exercise describing a task that the user is instructed to complete and

launching the virtual machine so the user can perform the task. Harned et al does not

detail the types of questions asked but does disclose examination items comprising

questions. Multiple choice or essay questions are conventional in the education art and

would have been obvious to use in the Harned et al invention. Harned et al does not

discuss setting a timer, however, timing an exercise is conventional in the education art

and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include for the

examination items of Harnet et al. File modification is inherent in the computer

implemented method disclosed by Harned et al.

1) FIELD OF THE INVENTION

(2) The present invention relates to computer based training systems. More specifically it concerns a training system operating within the environment of the software it teaches; where the training system utilizes software events to analyze user actions, compare actions to expected results, and provide to the user appropriate feedback.

10) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

(11) It is an object of the present invention to solve the above-described problems, as further described below.

(12) In accordance with one aspect of the invention, there is provided a method and system for computer based training relating to a target system. A user interface is provided, the user interface including at least one graphic display portion, and a courseware viewer portion. At least one exercise module is provided, the exercise module having (1) at least one display file, (2) at least one script corresponding to the at least one display file, and (3) a work file, to be loaded into the target system. The script is displayed in the courseware viewer portion, and the corresponding display file is displayed in the at least one display window.

(1)   DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT

6)   Preferably, the training system is programmed utilizing the Java language, running in a virtual machine provided in the target software. A virtual machine inside the target software can take advantage of standard libraries or package classes (such as graphics drawing files or .DGN package classes) to allow ready access to elements which are to be operated on, e.g., design file elements, and environment settings. The virtual machine can include event generating code that generates software events corresponding to a completed step of each exercise, as well as code which responds to events which occur and initiates the interactive training. The event generating code can readily be incorporated into existing target system software. In the preferred embodiment, the elements to be operated on are graphic elements, and the target system is a graphics system.

17)   Advantageously, the instructional text that is displayed also includes links to on-line help and to other exercises that describe similar tools and topics within the subject software. Optionally, at the end of the training module, a list of similar topics would be displayed to the user, so that the user can select a another exercise to continue the training session. Summary questions could also be displayed as HTML files with answers which would provide immediate feedback to the student.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the inventions of Anderson et and Roschelle et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John E. Rovnak whose telephone number is (703) 308-3087. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on (703) 308-2217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

John Rovnak
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714

* * *